DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 284 HE 016 270

AUTHOR Carnahan, Robert E.; Cancro, John Patrick
TITLE Authoritarianism and the Blue-Collar Student.
PUB DATE [82]
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Authoritarianism; *Blue Collar Occupations; *Cultural Differences; *Family Characteristics; Higher Education; *Personality Traits; Religious Differences; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; Two Year Colleges; Working Class
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

The relationship between students' family background (blue-collar versus nonblue-collar) and authoritarianism, as measured by the California F-Scale, was studied. In addition, strategies that might be used to assist faculty in teaching students with authoritarian tendencies are suggested. The sample consisted of 222 students attending a two-year branch campus of the Pennsylvania State University. It was found that students from blue-collar backgrounds scored significantly higher on authoritarianism, which includes the variables of submission, aggression, anti-intraception, power and toughness, and projection. Parental occupational difference was the key socioeconomic variable for predicting significant differences between authoritarian scores. Authoritarianism was higher for blue-collar, male, Catholic, two-year students as compared to non-blue-collar, female, Protestant, Jewish, and four-year students. It is suggested that in order to effectively teach these students, the faculty member should be aware of the personality and cultural reality of the students, especially as it compares to their own cultural reality and personality. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231284

UNPUBLISHED

Authoritarianism and the Blue-Collar Student

Submitted by:

Robert E. Carnahan, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Sociology
The Pennsylvania State University
(New Kensington Campus)

John Patrick Cancro
Assistant Professor of Business Administration
The Pennsylvania State University
(New Kensington Campus)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E. Carnahan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 016 270

Abstract

The characteristics of students who are attending institutions of higher education are changing. This is due primarily to the fact that pool of traditional types of students has been declining and is predicted to continue this decline through the decade of the eighties. Institutions of higher education find themselves in the awkward position of actively recruiting new aggregates of students in order to keep the doors open. Included in these new student aggregates are—older persons, women who have delayed their education, lower strata persons, persons from blue-collar homes, foreign students, etc. The focus in this study is on the new student aggregate from blue-collar backgrounds. The findings of this exploratory research indicate that authoritarianism, as measured by the California F-Scale, is higher for blue-collar, male, Catholic, two-year (associate degree) students as compared to nonblue-collar, female, Protestant, Jewish and four-year (baccalaureate degree) students. The discussion that ensues attempts to deal with the implication of these findings for faculty persons who are attempting, in many instances for the first time, to deal with this new aggregate of students from blue-collar backgrounds. In order to effectively teach these students the faculty person should be aware of the personality and cultural reality of these students, especially as it compares to their own cultural reality and personality. And last, specific teaching strategies are suggested that might expedite the socialization process of the blue-collar student.

Authoritarianism and the Blue-Collar Student

The following research attempts to determine if there is a relationship between selected independent variables derived from the students' familial and personal background, and a dependent variable, the students' authoritarianism, as measured by their score on the California F-Scale (Adorno, et al. 1950).[1] The specific independent variables selected for this study included such family related socioeconomic variables as parents' occupation, education and income. Personal independent variables included the students' sex, religion and choice of two-year versus four-year college program. Several researchers related specific independent variables, like those listed above, to authoritarianism. For example, Lessing, et al. (1976); Adorno, et al. (1950); Glock and Stark (1966) attempted to relate religion to authoritarianism. Education was examined in relation to authoritarianism by Weiss, et al. (1970); Mason (1978); Shaw and Funderburk (1976) and Plant (1966). Hansford and Olphert (1979) and Ayers, et al. (1978) studied the relationship between choice of university program and open versus closed mindedness. Strata was related to authoritarianism by Adorno, et al. (1950) and Grabb (1979). Finally, variations in authoritarianism by age and sex were specified by Adorno, et al. (1950).

The dependent variable in the following research is authoritarianism. Adorno and his associates in their book, The Authoritarian Personality, have formulated the basic theory and research on this subject. Their efforts represent the cumulative result of approximately ten years of work on the subject of prejudice and anti-Semitism. This definitive study succeeded in developing an instrument to measure a personality predisposition toward authoritarianism and a political predisposition toward Fascism. The authors

were also able to link authoritarianism with several other variables including: ethnocentrism, conservatism, religious dogmatism, sexism, strata, age, etc.

The focus of the following research was narrowed to explore the relationship between students' family background (blue-collar versus nonblue-collar)2 and score on the California F-Scale. The basic hypothesis contends that students from blue-collar family backgrounds will score higher on authoritarianism than students from nonblue-collar family backgrounds. This focus in the research seemed appropriate for three reasons. First, the research topic had to be narrowed in order to establish a reasonable unit of study. Second, the majority of students at the two-year institution involved in the study are from blue-collar backgrounds. Personal experience (student-teacher role) seemed to indicate that the relationship suggested by Adorno, et al. (1950) in his research, between strata and authoritarianism, does exist. The third reason for focusing this research question is related to the changing characteristics of the college-student population pool.

According to Census Bureau predictions, the number of persons enrolled in our nation's colleges and universities should decline by eighteen percent between 1980 - 1990. By 1985 there should be 1.7 million fewer eighteen to twenty-one year olds than in 1980 (Kottler, 1980). New student aggregates are being recruited (e.g., foreign students, adults, lower-class, women, blue-collar students, etc.) by colleges and universities in order to offset the anticipated loss of what are being increasingly referred to in the educational literature as traditional students. Thus students from blue-collar backgrounds comprise an increasing segment of the new student aggregates. These new aggregates are referred to as nontraditional students (Astin, et al., 1972; Pelatson and Massengale, 1978; Hall, 1974).

Because of their age, sex, race, strata, etc., these nontraditional students are bringing a different cultural frame of reference to the college situation. It may be expedient for faculty and administrative persons to adjust their approach to these students. Educational literature suggests that sound pedagogy begins with the students' experiential level.

An attempt to study all of these new student aggregates is beyond the limited resources of the current researchers. Due to these limited resources and the exploratory nature of the research, the emphasis in this research will be on the relationship between blue-collar background and authoritarianism.

Purposes and Hypotheses

The purposes of the study were: (1) to compare the California F-Scale scores of students with different family background characteristics—parental educational levels, income levels and occupations (blue-collar versus nonblue-collar); (2) to compare the California F-Scale scores of students with different personal characteristics - sex (male versus female), religion (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish or none) and choice of college program (two-year versus four-year); (3) to suggest teaching strategies that might be used to assist faculty persons attempting to teach students with authoritarian tendencies.

The purposes are specified in the following null hypotheses:

I. There will be no significant difference between the scores of students from blue-collar and nonblue-collar backgrounds on the California F-Scale.

II. There will be no significant difference between the scores of students with different family incomes on the California F-Scale.

III. There will be no significant difference between the scores of students whose parents have different levels of education on the California F-Scale.

IV. There will be no significant difference between the scores of male versus female students on the California F-Scale.

V. There will be no significant difference between the scores of students from different religious backgrounds on the California F-Scale.

VI. There will be no significant difference between the scores of students who choose two-year as compared to students who choose four-year programs.

Methods

Subjects

Subjects totaled 222 students enrolled in various classes at a branch campus (two-year campus) of The Pennsylvania State University. The student population is drawn primarily from blue-collar homes. Sixty-five percent of the sample population were drawn from blue-collar homes, which is almost exactly representative of percentage of blue-collar students in the total student population (sixty-six percent). These 222 student subjects represent a twenty-two percent sample of the total campus population.

Procedure

An experimenter, the same person in all instances, entered the six sample classes in sociology, engineering, mathematics, philosophy, education and business and asked for student volunteers to answer the questions on the California F-Scale. There were no refusals. The experimenter next read the instructions for completing the questionnaire in order to ensure that all subjects understood the directions. Confidentiality of all respondents was

emphasized as was the fact that the items on the questionnaire were designed to measure attitudes and not knowledge or skills. Therefore, the student need not be concerned about "right" or "wrong" answers.

Instrument

The first part of the questionnaire contained the personal and social characteristics (independent variables) consistent with the hypotheses and the second part contained the specific items in the California F-Scale. The California F-Scale (Forms 40 and 45) contain nine variables described as characteristics of an authoritarian personality. These variables include:

(1) Conventionalism. Rigid adherence to conventional middle-class values.

(2) Authoritarian submission. Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.

(3) Authoritarian aggression. Tendency to be on the lookout for and to condemn, reject and punish people who violate conventional values.

(4) Anti-intraception. Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.

(5) Superstition and stereotyping. The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate. The disposition to think in rigid categories.

(6) Power and "toughness." Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension, identification with powerful figures, overemphasis upon the conventional attributes of the ego, exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.

(7) Destructiveness and cynicism. Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.

(8) Projectivity. The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.

(9) Sex. Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings on" (Adorno, et al., 1950, p. 228).

Statistical Technique

Analysis of variance was used as the technique to test the null hypotheses. T-tests were engaged to determine the probability that the mean scores being compared were from the same or different samples. A signigicance level of .10 was chosen as a standard for accepting or not accepting the null hypotheses (Balsley, 1970, pp. 56-57).

Insert Table Here

Results

Results of the study indicated that there were significant differences between the mean scores of certain aggregates (independent variables) on the California F-Scale.

Of the first three null hypotheses (occupation, income and education of parents) only in the case of the occupational variable (blue-collar versus nonblue-collar backgrounds) was the null hypothesis rejected. Thus the major contention of the study was confirmed. The results from the T-test indicated that students from blue-collar backgrounds do score higher on the California

F-Scale ($\bar{x}$ = 113) and are, therefore, more authoritarian than their nonblue-collar peers ($\bar{x}$ = 103). The level of significance was 0.002. More specifically, students from blue-collar backgrounds scored significantly higher on the variables of submission, aggression, anti-intraception, power and toughnexx and projection.

As the results from Table 1 indicate, the other two null hypotheses dealing with socioeconomic position (differences in parental income level and parental educational level) could not be rejected. The difference between the means in the categories specified was not significant. Thus, in this sample, parental occupational difference was the key socioeconomic variable for predicting significant differences between authoritarian scores rather than either parental income or educational level.

In attempting to explain the nonsignificance of parental income in predicting authoritarianism it is important to note that the income of many blue-collar workers was as high, and in some instances higher, than many of their nonblue-collar counterparts.

Null hypothesis 3, concerning educational background and authoritarianism, was not rejected either. This result poses a perplexing question because Edward Grabb (1979) found education to be a key variable in predicting tolerance for outgroups when white-collar and blue-collar persons were compared. Persons from white-collar backgrounds scored higher on tolerance than blue-collar persons. Authoritarians tend to be more intolerant. Perhaps one explanation for the nonsignificant authoritarian scores between the blue-collar and nonblue-collar persons in terms of education was due to the heterogeneity of educational backgrounds exhibited by parents of nonblue-collar students. Most of the parents of students from nonblue-collar homes in this survey had lower and middle level white-collar occupations

(e.g., small store owners, salesmen, technicians, etc.). Many of these occupations require either a high school diploma, technical education or on the job training. Thus the overlap in education and income levels between blue-collar and nonblue-collar families was probably responsible for the nonrejection of null hypothesis 2 (parental income) and 3 (parental education).

Null hypothesis 4 was rejected. The mean scores of the male ($\bar{x}$ = 104) was significantly different (0.02). The differences were greatest on the submission and aggression variables. Males tend to be more aggressive and females tend to be more submissive in both the blue-collar and nonblue-collar samples. This data would seem to be consistent with the traditional male-female sex role socialization. Research by Adorno, et al., (1950) and Badgett, et al., (1974) indicated similar results when they compared the authoritarianism of the sexes.

Null hypothesis 5 was also rejected, but at the .10 level of significance. Catholics scored higher ($\bar{x}$ = 113) than Protestants ($\bar{x}$ = 107), Jews ($\bar{x}$ = 105.5, N = 3) or those students who chose the category of no religion ($\bar{x}$ = 100). Thus a directional finding might suggest that Catholics tend to be more authoritarian in their attitudes than other religious aggregates. These findings would seem to relate to the research of Rokeach (1960) and Glock and Stark (1966). Both studies linked religious dogmatism with authoritarianism.

The sixth null hypothesis (two-year versus four-year students) was also rejected at the .10 level of significance, indicating that, in this sample, two-year students scored higher ($\bar{x}$ = 118) on the California F-Scale than their four-year counterparts ($\bar{x}$ = 113). If current educational and job opportunity trends continue in the same direction, we may see an increasing proportion of potential four-year students opting for two-year degrees. The Chronicle of Higher Education in a "Fact-File" (1981) segment, pointed out that more students today are worried about getting jobs and view the two-year degree as

a more attractive option. Authoritarian distinctions on the basis of degree choice may be blurred by this trend.

Discussion and Implications of the Findings in Relation to Teaching Strategies for Undergraduate Students

The findings of this exploratory research support the contention that students differ in the degree of authoritarianism that they bring with them to their educational institutions. As the data indicate, the blue-collar, male, Catholic and two-year students score higher on the California F-Scale than do their nonblue-collar, female, Protestant and Jewish and four-year counterparts.

If educators and administrators recognize they are likely to be encountering these new types of students[3] (the focus in this study was the blue-collar student) in the present and future, it may be expedient for them to reexamine some of their pedagogical and administrative techniques in order to more efficiently relate to these students' needs. Educators must begin with the students' own experiential base to enhance the possibility for successful socialization.

Therefore, it is critical at this juncture of the discussion to attempt to delineate the specific personality characteristics attributed to persons who have been reared in the blue-collar culture. Kohn's (1959, 1969) extensive research on this subject will serve as a basis for summarizing the characteristics of the blue-collar personality and culture. His summary of these characteristics involves a comparison with personality syndromes produced by socialization into the middle- and upper-class cultures. Persons from blue-collar backgrounds tend to be raised by parents who emphasize: obedience, honesty, conformity, neatness, security and extrinsic rewards

(especially in relation to work). When compared to their middle- and upper-class counterparts, they tend to be: more authoritarian, oriented toward the present rather than the future, less confident about their skills and to feel less in control of their lives. Persons from blue-collar backgrounds do not participate as much politically—voting, joining political parties, running for office, etc. Kahn also contends that the working class are more liberal on economic issues and more conservative on civil rights issues than their middle- and upper-strata counterparts.

Further, if educators assume that many of the characteristics attributed to authoritarians in the research (e.g., close-mindedness [Shaw & Funderburk, 1976]; inflexibility [Harvey, 1963]; over-obedience [Milgrim, 1963]; intolerance [Pace & Stern, 1958]; toughness [Adorno, et al., 1950]; aggression [Adorno, et al., 1950]; etc.) may lead to specific problems in our society (e.g., religious dogmatism [Adorno, et al., 1950]; racism [Lessing, Barbera & Arnold, 1976]; sexism [Ayers, Rohr & Rohr, 1973]; ethnocentrism [Thomas, 1974]; Fascism [Adorno, et al., 1950]; etc.). It may, therefore, be expedient for educators to at least be aware of segments of the new student aggregates that may manifest these ideological and attitudinal predispositions. If educators are cognizant of these predispositions on the part of the new student aggregate (blue-collar), they may make efforts to modify these tendencies through the teaching and learning process. McKeachie (1960) contends that educators must not only consider the cognitive development of their students but also the opportunity to develop problem solving and desirable attitudes as well.

At this juncture of the discussion a note of caution should be interjected lest we become too overzealous in relating authoritarianism with strata. Even though the blue-collar students scored significantly higher than their

nonblue-collar college peers, both aggregates scored lower on the per item mean that Adorno's, et al. (1950) aggregates than were used to norm his authoritarian scale. Adorno's mean was 3.81 and the mean item score recorded in this research was 3.77 for blue-collar students and 3.43 for nonblue-collar students. The aggregates in Adorno's study tended to score higher on authoritarian aggression and submission. The overall, slightly higher scores in Adorno's sample, probably reflect the differences in educational level between the sample in this research (high school plus) and Adorno's sample, which is national and reflects more heterogeneity in educational achievement.

At this point in the discussion it might prove beneficial to summarize the personal and cultural characteristics of faculty persons in higher education in order to see how these faculty persons compare to the new blue-collar student aggregates. During September 1975 through May 1976 a series of articles appeared almost weekly in The Chronicle of Higher Education. These articles reported the characteristics of faculty persons based on an extensive survey by Ladd & Lipset. Following will be a summary of some of the tendencies of faculty persons according to that report. Professors in higher education tend to be predominantly Protestant with Jews being overrepresented in relation to their proportion in the general population. Approximately three-fourths of the professoriate reflect a British Isles and Northern Europe ethnic background. Women constitute about 21% of all faculty persons and their numbers are growing in the younger ranks (about 1/3). Economically (income) the faculty would be rated in the middle to upper middle class. Politically the academics make up America's most liberal aggregate especially in the humanities and social sciences. Faculty persons were much more likely than the general public to actively oppose the Vietnam War. In terms of identification with a political party, faculty

persons tend to be overwhelmingly democrat, but they are separated from rank and file Democrats on many issues—endorsing busing, supporting cuts in defense, meeting urban problems, etc. In terms of perceived ability to influence major public affairs issues (power), most faculty persons view themselves as the least influential elite aggregate when compared to government, military, industrial and business elites. And last, faculty persons overwhelmingly support collective bargaining for themselves and others.

It should also be mentioned that faculty persons are recruited from the ranks of undergraduate students on a selective basis. Brown (1962) contends that undergraduate students who become graduate students, and are the more likely to end up as college professors, seem to have a distinctive personality configuration:

> The teachers nominate people who have a good credit ratio, who are high on admission criteria, but not necessarily the top candidates, who have high social maturity, who show a moderate amount of impulse expression, who are low on measures of suppression and expression, who achieve high developmental status as seniors, who are low on conformity and integration into the student peer culture, who have adequate self-confidence, who are mildly dominating, who tend toward masculine interests and who are low on authoritarian tendencies both personally and with respect to sociopolitical issues. (p. 544)

From the above summaries of characteristics typical of the blue-collar student and the faculty person in higher education, it should be noted that there are obvious differences in family background (education, income, etc.), child-rearing practices and, therefore, cultural values. Albert Ellis (1965)

contends that a type of personality syndrome emerges among some persons who are the recipients of higher education. He calls this syndrome "Intellectual Fascism." It is Ellis's contention that the "Intellectual Fascist" assumes that white, male, cultured, educated, sophisticated, etc., persons view themselves as superior to lesser (uneducated) persons. These persons support socially acceptable liberal causes, such as opposing racism, sexism, etc. But they, at the same time, tend to be extremely ethnocentric toward such aggregates as the blue-collar class. The purpose here is not to agree totally with Ellis, but to suggest that as social scientists we must be aware that ethnocentrism may not be totally absent from the academic personality. There are indeed significant differences between the culture and personality of the blue-collar student as compared to the cultural reality and personality of the typical faculty person. To deny that these differences do, in some instances, lend themselves to faculty ethnocentrism toward blue-collar students would be naive. Awareness of the students' and one's own culture reality is critical to the effective learning process (Lancaster, 1974; Good, et al., 1975; Flournoy, 1972; etc.).

The next section of this discussion will address the issue of how faculty persons may most effectively teach students from blue-collar backgrounds, who tend to be more authoritarian than the traditional students. In other words, based on the knowledge of our own and the blue-collar students' personalities and culture realities, how do we as educators most effectively teach this new aggregate of students?

The educational literature does suggest numerous techniques or strategies geared to meet the needs of blue-collar students, as well as to modify their

authoritarianism. Several authors (e.g., Korn, 1968; Plant, 1966; Erikson, 1968; and Chickering, 1969) indicate there is a general liberalization of college students' attitudes as they progress through their education. This is probably due to both the maturation that attends aging and the effect of education on the students.

Thus the conclusion one might draw from these findings is that maturation and education might combine to liberalize young persons attitudes. As Erikson (1968) suggests, the insecurity attendant with the identity crisis stage during adolescence and the desire to be accepted socially may be critical factors in the young person's extremely ethnocentric attachment to his peer culture and his almost neurotic need to conform to that peer culture. It could be argued that the generic problems associated with adolescence by Erikson (1968) and Chickering (1969) may be extended into postadolescence as the period of youthful dependence in our society has been extended. It could be further argued that as it takes longer to integrate young people into our society, the adolescent identity crisis, and its attendant problems, are also extended. Therefore, faculty persons are more likely to see less liberal young persons in their classes as a general consequence of this educational extension. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1981) documents this shift in student attitudes and identity from liberal to more conservative when current students are compared to students of the previous decade.

The research of Neel (1959) suggests that students who have authoritarian predispositions have more difficulty understanding humanitarian philosophical and social science subjects, which they define as ambiguous, too abstract and not useful. This would seem to be consistent with the original findings of Adorno, et al. (1950) concerning authoritarianism. Therefore, it may be

important in classroom procedure to specify objectives for any course and to suggest, where possible, the utility of one's subject matter at the very beginning of any course where a large percentage of students have blue-collar backgrounds. These students relate well to specific, rather than abstract, knowledge that has applications to their current life. Study for study's sake, is not a viable, valid motivator for most of these students—at least in the beginning of the course. Therefore, examples concerning the utility of the subject matter should be liberally sprinkled throughout the content of the course. The object, again where possible, should be to relate one's course content with the blue-collar student's reality and personality.

The taxonomy of educational objectives specified by Bloom (1956) might be useful as a model for establishing goals and objectives for one's classroom. While using the Bloom taxonomy, care should be exercised in trying to move students through the hierarchical sequence. It is probably a good idea to start from the concrete objectives, where most blue-collar students seem to be comfortable, to the more abstract, theoretical objectives. The sequence progresses as follows: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Thus if teachers are dealing with freshmen or sophomores from blue-collar backgrounds, perhaps the most that they can realistically expect is to assist the student to progress from knowledge, through comprehension to application. The learning and application of material would seem to lend itself most readily to the concrete and utility-oriented, blue-collar student.

Highly authoritarian students are more likely to prefer very structured, organized, lecture-oriented classrooms (Bendig & Hountras, 1959; Beach, 1960; Pace & Stern, 1958; and Stern, 1962). This would seem consistent with Adorno's, et al. (1950) results that the authoritarian tends to be submissive to authority

figures. Indeed, Weiss, et al. (1970) and Levin (1968) indicate that teacher authoritarianism does affect student attitudes. Thus modeling and identification would seem to be important in student learning. The more authoritarian the teacher the more this supports the real or potential authoritarianism of one's students. The research of DeCharms and Wilkins (1962) supports this contention. Persons high on authoritarianism are more influenced by power cues eminating from higher status persons, expecially as this influence relates to attitudes about others. Faculty persons should be very careful that they do not directly or indirectly support student prejudices and/or stereotypes. It may also prove beneficial to the more authoritarian students to gradually reduce the lecture-oriented structure of the classroom to a more discussion-oriented process. As Stern (1962) points out, this may be seriously resisted at first by the more authoritarian student. But, in the long run, your goal may be to wean the student away from excessive dependence on authority figures who think for them. The objectives would not just be the incorporation of knowledge on the part of the student, but also to develop a degree of free-association, autonomy and independent thinking on the part of the student. Student-centered, discussion-oriented methods are more likely to foster the development of this higher order objectives than instructor dominated, lecture methods (Gage, et al., 1963).

Again, a word of caution should be interjected at this juncture. Anderson (1959) in his summary review of studies comparing authoritarian and democratic leadership styles in the classroom situation found that democratic leadership and a learner-centered orientation appeared to foster student morale, while tight organization and authoritarian leadership appeared to increase student productivity. A summary of all the educational literature reviewed would seem

to indicate that there is no singular-best or most effective method for teaching anyone. Thus leadership style and method of teaching should be flexible, contingent upon the intermix of desired objectives, personality of the faculty person and needs of the student.

The question of attitude and attitude change would seem to be another critical issue. As we have reported previously, authoritarian attitudes have been linked to various ideologies—Fascism, racism, sexism, religious dogmatism and ethnocentrism. These ideologies do serve as a basis for serious problems in our society. Historically, a great deal of violence has been rationalized on the basis of these ideologies. Therefore, it is important to entertain the question involving the reduction of the effect of these ideologies in society.

The beginning point in reducing authoritarianism in society would seem to be through education (both at home and in school). As educators, it may be that a systematic effort to make persons aware of authoritarianism and its consequences is appropriate and valuable. Highly authoritarian students should be made aware that others do not possess the same attitudes that they do toward minorities (Scodel & Mussen, 1953). Authoritarians have a tendency to believe that others perceive situations and persons as they do. It must be made clear to authoritarian young persons that because others do not perceive the world the way they do, that these others are not necessarily bad or wrong (Steiner & Johnson, 1963). Further, these students must be made aware that authoritarianism is dangerous to others (e.g., racism, sexism, etc.) and to the society in which they live (Fascism vs. Democracy). Knowledge then can be used as a basis of change. Several studies indicate that as the level of education rises, the degree of authoritarianism is reduced (Lambert, 1960; Ward, et al., 1978; Shaw & Funderburk, 1976; Adorno, et al., 1950; etc.).

Again, caution should be exercised in interpreting this relationship because what may be effected by education is a recognition by educated persons that many of the items on the F-Scale are very jingoistic (Wrightsman, 1972). Thus educated persons may be more cautious or reluctant to express what, in their culture, is viewed as less socially acceptable attitudes. This unwillingness to put one's prejudice into a form of behavior (discrimination) seems to be a preferable beginning point to its alternative. In other words, education may not necessarily eliminate previously learned prejudice, but as long as it significantly reduces the tendency to discriminate, it is valuable to a democracy.

Attitude change could probably begin by using Festinger's (1957) concept of cognitive dissonance. The teacher can make the point that authoritarianism and its related ideologies are not consistent with democratic ideology, thus creating a situation of cognitive dissonance for the authoritarian student. Another theory, related to cognitive dissonance, which might be used to change student attitudes is reactance theory (Brehm & Cohen, 1962).

Students are more likely to change their attitudes if they view their professors as trustworthy, experts and likeable (Vander Zanden, 1977). Fear may be an effective tool in attitude change (Vander Zanden, 1977). Especially if alternatives are given to authoritarian positions. It is probably also important to provide students with two-sided arguments (functional and dysfunctional aspects of authoritarianism) since most authoritarian students would initially be opposed to your arguments (Vander Zanden, 1977).

On the other hand, students who are very defensive will be less persuadable. They are much more likely to protect their self-image and opinion. Care should

be taken not to unnecessarily arouse the authoritarian's defensiveness. Assumptions or statements on the part of the professor that authoritarian attitudes are bad or wrong are less effective than treating the subject from a neutral position (Vander Zanden, 1977) and allowing the student to resolve their own dissonance.

From these specific suggestions, it seems appropriate to state some general goals that might assist faculty persons.

One of these general goals for a faculty person to consider when their classes have a high percentage of blue-collar students might be to gradually move these students to a point, cognitively, where they can use and be comfortable with more abstract types of knowledge (Piaget, 1962).

Further goals that faculty persons may consider might be that one can no longer make the same assumptions that were previously made concerning traditional students. Educators might attempt to move blue-collar students to a point in their educational experience where they might:

(1) Be willing to entertain and understand beliefs that are different than their own by graphically displaying the costs in human suffering caused by racism, sexism, ethnocentrism, agism, authoritarianism, etc., in our society.

(2) Be willing to engage in intellectual activities (e.g., reasoning, thinking, synthesizing) by graphically displaying the negative effects of antiintellectualism and antiacademic attitudes current in our society.

These first two goals would be particularly relevant for discussion in social science and humanities type courses. The utility of these types of courses could be

emphasized in explaining and studying current social problems.

(3) Be successful in social science and humanities courses. In order for the blue-collar student to be successful, in these types of courses, it may be necessary to review, very specifically, exactly what the student needs to know (objectives and syllabus) and how the student should study (time, effort, exams, etc.) requisite to meeting the course objectives. If term papers are assigned, examples should be given of good term papers (style, footnotes, bibliography, etc.). Success, through preparation, is likely to foster interest and motivation in the students own socialization or self-actualization (Maslow, 1954).

(4) Be able to reduce extreme moralism associated with authoritarianism (Alper, et al., 1964). This moralism often closes the student out of meaningful learning experiences by filtering all information through their own "right or wrong" screen.

A final suggestion is aimed at educators who have a potential effect on their students. It may be a sound idea to periodically assess one's own potential authoritarianism. As educators and role models, faculty persons may be directly or indirectly reinforcing negative authoritarian predispositions in their students. This may be particularly true with respect to blue-collar, male, two-year and/or Catholic students. Both Weiss, et al. (1970) and Levin (1968) report that teacher's authoritarianism does have an effect on their students' attitudes.

It has been the researchers' experience as educators that the above suggestions and techniques when implemented in the classroom discussions tend to increase student's satisfaction with the course and with the instructor's performance in the course. These last two items were measured by standard student evaluations of courses in the respective discipline areas of sociology and business.

The suggestions rendered are not intended to indicate that these are the only possible strategies that can be implemented or even that the strategies will inevitably work for all instructors. What is suggested by this exploratory research is that educators will be attempting to teach new aggregates of nontraditional types of students who will be different in many respects from the traditional types of students they have been used to working with in the past. Faculty persons should be willing to entertain suggestions that might expedite the educational process for these new aggregates of students.

Table 1

Summary on the Level of Significances Between the Scores of Selected Independent Variables of the California F-Scale

Independent Variables	Level of Significant Differences
1. Blue-collar versus nonblue-collar	++
2. Income levels	
0 - 6,999	
7,000 - 14,999	-
15,000 - 24,999	
over 25,000	
3. Educational levels	
Grade school	
High school	-
High school plus college	
4. Male versus female	++
5. Religious differences	
Protestant	
Catholic	+
Jewish	
None	
6. Two-year versus four-year	+

++ = significant at the 0.05 level

+ = significant at the 0.10 level

- = not significant

Footnotes

[1]The California F-Scale (Forms 40 and 45) used in this study was developed by T. W. Adorno, et al. (1950). Within the California F-Scale are nine subscales which will be described in the instrument section.

[2]The Dictionary of Occupational Titles: Occupational Classification, 1965 and The Dictionary of Personnel Management and Labor Relations, 1980 were the sources used to define and classify blue-collar and nonblue-collar students.

[3]See New Colleges for New Students by Laurence Hall, et al., 1974, for a discussion of these new types of students.

Bibliography

Adorno, T., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. Levinson and N. Sanford. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Alper, T., V. Levin and M. Klein. "Authoritarian vs. Human Conscience." Journal of Personality, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1964, pp. 313-333.

Anderson, R. C. "Learning in Discussion: A Resumé of the Authoritarian-Democratic Studies." Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, pp. 201-215.

Astin, H. S., A. W. Astin, A. S. Bisconti and H. H. Frankel. Higher Education and The Disadvantaged Student. Washington, D. C.: Human Services Press, 1972.

Ayers, J. B., M. E. Rohr and E. M. Rohr. "College Major, Authoritarianism and Attitudes Toward Women." College Student Journal, Vol. 12, Spring 1978, pp. 236-239.

Badgett, J., S. Fair and R. Hunkler. "The Authoritarianism Exhibited by Intelligent Men and Women." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 15, Nov. 1974, pp. 509-512.

Balsley, H. Quantitative Research Methods for Business Economics. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

Beach, L. R. "Sociability and Academic Achievement in Various Types of Learning Situations." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, pp. 208-212.

Bendig, A. W. and P. T. Hountras. "Anxiety, Authoritarianism and Student Attitude Toward Departmental Control of College Instruction." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 50, pp. 1-8.

Bloom, S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Brehm, J. W. and A. R. Cohen. Explorations in Cognitive Dissonance (New York: Wiley, 1962).

Brown, D. "Personality, College Environments and Productivity." The American College (Ed. N. Sanford), New York: Wiley, 1962.

Chickering, A. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969, pp. 1-134.

Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1918.

DeCharms, R. and E. J. Wilkens. "Authoritarianism and Response to Power Cues." Journal of Personality, Vol. 30, No. 3, 1962, pp. 439-444.

Dictionary of Occupational Titles: Occupational Classification. U. S. Department of Labor, Third Edition, Vol. 2, 1965.

Ellis, A. Suppressed (Chicago, Illinois: New Classics House, 1965).

Erikson, E. Identity and Youth in Crises. New York: Norton Co., 1968, Part III, "The Life Cycle," pp. 91-141.

"Fact-File: Freshman Characteristics and Attitudes." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XXI, Number 22, Feb. 9, 1981, pp. 7-8.

Festinger, L. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957).

"Fewer Liberals, More Moderates Among This Year's Freshmen." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XXI, Number 22, Feb. 9, 1981, p. 5.

Flournoy, D. M.(Ed.) The New Teachers (Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers: 1972).

Gage, N. L.(Ed.) "Research on Teaching at the College and University Level" by W. J. McKeachie. Handbook of Research on Teaching: A Project of the American Education Association (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963).

Glock, C. and R. Stark. Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Good, T. L., B. J. Biddle and J. E. Brophy. Teachers Make a Difference (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1975).

Grabb, E. "Working Class Authoritarianism and Tolerance For Out-Groups: A Reassessment." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 43, Spring 1979, pp. 36-47.

Hall, Laurence. New Colleges for New Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Company, Inc., 1974.

Hansford, B. L. and W. B. Olphert. "Open-Closed Mindedness and Choice of University Program." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 107, Feb. 1979, pp. 111-116.

Harvey, O. J. "Authoritarianism and Conceptual Functioning in Varied Conditions." Journal of Personality, Vol. 31, No. 4, 1963, pp. 462-470.

Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and Parental Values." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 64, January 1959, pp. 337-351.

Kohn, M. L. Class and Conformity. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1969.

Korn, H. "Personality Scale Changes from the Freshman to the Senior Year." No Time For Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968, pp. 162-184.

Kottler, J. "College Admissions." Editorial Research Reports, Vol. 1, No. 14, April 11, 1980.

Ladd, E. C., Jr. and S. M. Lipset. From a series of articles that appeared in The Chronicle of Higher Education between Sept. 15, 1975 and May 31, 1976.

Lambert, P. "Administration of the F-Scale to a Sample of Elementary School Principals and Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 53, No. 9, May 1960, pp. 336-340.

Lancaster, O. E. Effective Teaching and Learning (New York: Gordon & Breach, Science Publishers, Inc., 1974).

Lessing, E. E., L. Barbera and B. Arnold. "Teaching Nuns' Perceptions of White and Black Pupils as a Function of Authoritarianism and Other Factors." Community Mental Health Journal, Vol. 12, Summer 1976, pp. 82-91.

Levin, M. "Changes in Authoritarianism." No Time for Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968, pp. 376-385.

Lipset, S. "Democracy and Working Class Authoritarianism." American Sociological Review, Vol. 24, 1959, pp. 482-502.

Magarrel, J. "Fall Enrollment Sets Record Despite Fewer Eighteen Year Olds." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XXI, No. 13, Nov. 12, 1980, p. 3.

Maslow, A. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Mason, E. S. "Authoritarian Development." Educational Horizon, Vol. 57, Fall 1978, pp. 25-30.

McKeachie, W. J. Teaching Tips (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Wahr Publishing Company, 1960).

Milgrim, S. "Behavioral Study of Obedience." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1963, 67, pp. 371-378.

Neel, A. "The Relationship of the Authoritarian Personality to Learning: F-Scale Scores Compared to Classroom Performance." The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 50, No. 5, 1959, pp. 195-201.

Pace, C. R. and G. G. Stern. "A Criterion Study of College Environment." Syracuse, N. Y.: Psychological Research Center, Syracuse University, 1958.

Pelatson, J. W. and M. V. Massengale. Students and Their Institutions: A Changing Relationship. American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1978.

Piaget, J. The Language of Thought of the Child. New York: Humanities Press, 1962.

Plant, W. "Longitudinal Changes in Intolerance and Authoritarianism for Subjects Differing in the Amount of College Education of Four Years." Genetic Psychology Monography, Vol. 74, 1966, pp. 3-36.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rosow, J. "The Blue Collar Blues." Integrated Education, Vol. 9, May-June 1971, pp. 32-37.

Scodel, A. and P. Mussen. "Social Perceptions of Authoritarians and Non-authoritarians." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, pp. 181-184.

Shafritz, M. Dictionary of Personnel Management and Labor Relations. Moore Publishing Company, Inc., 1980, p. 36.

Shaw, P. C. and C. Funderburk. "Teachers Political Attitudes: Alienation, Dogmatism and Commitment to Democratic Values." Urban Education, Vol. 10, Jan. 1976, pp. 336-78.

Steiner, I. and H. Johnson. "Authoritarianism and Trait Inconsistency." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, pp. 388-391.

Stern, G. G. "Environments for Learning." In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College (New York: Wiley, 1962), pp. 690-730.

Thomas, D. R. "Relationship Between Ethnocentrism and Conservatism in an Authoritarian Culture." Journal of Social Psychology, 94, 1974, pp. 179-186.

Vander Zanden, J. N. Social Psychology (New York: Random House, 1977).

Ward, G. R., C. H. Cunningham and M. L. Summerlin. "Personality Profiles and Dogmatism in Undergraduate Teacher Education Students." Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 15, Jan. 1978, pp. 33-36.

Weiss, R., S. Sales and S. Bode. "Student Authoritarianism as Factors in the Determination of Seudent Performance and Attitudes." The Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 38, No. 4, Summer 1970, pp. 83-87.

Wrightsman, L. S. Social Psychology in the Seventies (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972).